

E 458

.4

.B62

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00001739694









# THE JACOBINS OF MISSOURI AND MARYLAND.

## S P E E C H

—OF—

## HON. F. P. BLAIR, OF MISSOURI,

DELIVERED IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 27, '64

MR. CHAIRMAN: The affairs of my own and some other border States have been drawn into the debates of this House. I believe that when I addressed the House some time since, and alluded to a certain transaction which had taken place at the other end of this Capitol, I gave the true explanation of the motives for bringing Missouri affairs so often before the public and before Congress. Certain transactions which have occurred there are sought to be made issues in the next presidential election. My excuse for again alluding to these matters is the prominence which has thus been given to them.

My own conduct has been frequently brought under review, in considering these affairs. I am content to be silent as to the manner in which I have borne myself during this rebellion, believing that I have discharged my duty to the Government to the best of my ability, and being most willing to leave my record to stand the comparison with that of those who have thought proper to criticise or condemn my course.

Things have occurred in Missouri and the other border States not so easily understood by those who come from happier regions, unvisited by the calamities of war. In Missouri, at the outbreak of the rebellion, and for a long time afterwards, the State was a prey to the worst disorders. The country was ravaged and destroyed, and a feeling of bitterness has been engendered which is almost without a parallel. Upon this spirit of exasperation, retaliation, and revenge, the so called radicals of my State have undertaken to build up a party. Is this a fit foundation for any party to rest upon? Can peace, prosperity, and tranquility be expected from those who act from such motives? Can any secure or enduring principles of government be based upon such sentiments? It may be and it is impossible for men to free themselves from the passion of revenge, and the desire for retaliation on those who may have inflicted injuries on them or their friends and neighbors. It may be utterly impossible to expect that men can free themselves entirely from such influences. But, on the other hand, is it natural, proper, or wise, that the President and the great statesmen who are directing the affairs of the Government, and whose duty it is to educe peace and good will out of these scenes of anarchy and disorder, shou'd be actuated by the feelings of bitterness which have grown up among the parties to this strife? Such passions are in some degree excusable in those who have suffered injury; but with what face does a man set himself up as a statesman or party leader, who will fan such passions; who will contribute to the public exasperation; who will rekindle these smouldering fires; and who seeks even to drag into them and destroy the Chief Magistrate of the country, when he declines to be the instrument of such malignant passions? Yet this is the position of the Jacobin leaders in Missouri and their confederate Jacobins in Maryland. They appeal to the Union men of other States to support them in their efforts to keep up the strife in States in which the rebellion has been put down, instead of fighting to put down the rebellion where it still exists. They appeal to the Union men of other States against the President's policy of amnesty, by which the armies of the rebels are being demoralised and depleted, because they desire to glut their vengeance and their lust of spoils. They seek to make a direct issue with the President, to defeat his re-election, in order that they may enjoy

the license of another French Revolution under some chief as malignant as themselves.

The State of Missouri cast but seventeen thousand votes for Mr. Lincoln; yet she has contributed sixty thousand men to the volunteer army of the United States. The State has also a reserve force of sixty or seventy thousand militia, ready at a moment's notice to spring to their arms in defence of the State and the nation; and how well and how often they have performed this duty the House already knows from the speech made by my venerable colleague, [Mr. KING.] These men have flocked to the standard of the country, and given their best efforts to its defence, because the President called upon men of all parties, without regard to political differences, to rally to the defence of the Union. Suppose he had erected the standard now unfurled by the Jacobins of Missouri and Maryland, proscribing all who do not hold their present ultra dogmas, how many men would have enrolled themselves in Missouri under such a standard? I doubt whether we could have contributed half the number that supported the election of Mr. Lincoln. Happily for the country, the counsels of such people did not prevail at the outbreak of the war. All men who were willing to defend the country against its enemies, without regard to their opinions on the subject of slavery, or any other subject, were invited to take arms. They were not asked to lay down their political opinions, and accept those of the President or of his party. Now, these radical Jacobins denounce all who do not agree with them, whether they have taken arms in defence of their country or not, as traitors, and as unfaithful to the cause of freedom. The Missouri State militia, whose valor and services were so well described by my venerable colleague, [Mr. KING,] and but for whom these gentlemen would have had no districts to represent, and no homes to which they could return, have nevertheless been made the subject of the slanders and revilings of my revolution broaching colleagues.

I do not consider it necessary to add anything to my description of my four radical colleagues which was given the other day by my venerable colleague, [Mr. KING.] The picture will be recognized wherever they are known. I may say, however, that the artist [Governor KING] was a supporter of our great Senator Benton in his attempt to suppress the furious pro-slavery sentiment which has at last burst forth in rebellion, when they were one and all, without an exception, the persecutors of Col. Benton and his friends. My four Jacobin colleagues were at that time pro-slavery to the backbone. Now, as is often the case with renegades, they have gone far beyond those of us who have consistently supported the Government, and consistently opposed slavery; and they denounce us as unfaithful to the cause of human freedom.

A MEMBER. One renegade is worse than ten Turks.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I accept the suggestion. It is not only applicable to the Missouri radicals, but also those of Maryland. It behooves them to purge their own pro-slavery records by some appreciable service in the cause of freedom and emancipation before they should be permitted to denounce those who have passed through the fires of persecution (and they the persecutors) on account of their devotion to that cause.

I hope I shall not be regarded as uncharitable, but I cannot avoid looking at the course of these men as dictated more by a desire to cancel and obliterate the memory of their old crimes against the cause, rather than to advance its success in the future. Their ultra doctrines are so much better calculated to bring us defeat instead of victory, that it looks in the light of their past history as if this was their object; and the great body of the true Union men in other States have been sagacious enough to perceive this fact, and patriotic enough to act upon it. Hence, in the great State of New York, at the last election, the supporters of the Administration, and of the war, enlarged the name of the Republicans, and held the election under the name of the "Union" party, and nominated on their ticket men who had been life-long Democrats. My colleague, [Mr. BLOW,] who has just dropped his pro-slavery pen-feathers, and who absented himself from the country on a foreign mission in the hours of its sorest trial, in a speech which he made to attack me during my absence in the field, denounced and assailed the platform of the Union men of New York as a weak-kneed Union affair, because I had referred to it as a proof of their moderation and good sense in refusing to allow differences of opinion which have become trivial to peril the restoration of the Union. In the State of Ohio, also, the friends of the Administration have nominated and elected Democrats for Governor of the State for two successive terms, without regard to their former or present opinions on the subject of slavery.

It is left for these Jacobins and revolutionists to erect a loftier standard of loyalty and patriotism; to represent themselves as persecuted martyrs of a cause of which they are only the eleventh hour supporters; a cause which they would have strangled in its birth if they had the power to strangle it, and to which they have only brought their support when the battle was won, and their aid was not needed. They are like camp followers, unknown and unheard of while the battle raged, but are swift to plunder the dead, and merciless to the wounded. Like old Jack Falstaff, they mutilate the dead Percy, slain by another hand, bearing his body off on their backs as a proof of their desperate valor.

My colleague [Mr. BLOW] in his speech the other day, undertook to draw the line of distinction between himself and myself; between his principles and those which I advocate. He asserted that the radical party of Missouri was in favor of immediate and unconditional emancipation; and that I and the friends with whom I act were in favor of gradual emancipation. I have always been willing to accept gradual emancipation, or any other step in the right direction. I favored immediate emancipation in my own State, relying upon the compensation to loyal owners of slaves tendered by Congress; and whenever the people of Missouri or any other State desire it, and adopt this plan, I am more than willing to accept immediate emancipation. I cannot regard any one as an honest man who wishes to place the whole burden on the slaveholders, and who is unwilling to bear his share of the expense in accomplishing the general benefaction.

We have had recently an opportunity to test the sincerity of the Jacobins of Missouri on this question, and I intend now to expose the hypocrisy of their professions in favor of immediate emancipation to the very men they have deceived and misled by their clamors and misrepresentations. When the last Legislature which sat in Missouri first assembled, the constitution of our State permitted emancipation by the Legislature, either by the consent of the owners of slaves, or upon fair compensation to be made to them. The Congress of the United States had prior to that time, and upon the recommendation of Mr. Lincoln, passed a resolution pledging the General Government to pay for the slaves in any of the border States which should adopt measures for the abolition of slavery. The radicals, combined with the other Union men in favor of emancipation, composed a large and overwhelming majority in the Missouri Legislature. My friends offered various bills in favor of emancipation upon compensation. The radicals voted against and defeated every measure of this kind that was proposed. Congress at its last session passed a measure in this House appropriating \$10,000,000 to pay for the slaves of Missouri; the bill went to the Senate, and the sum was increased to \$20,000,000; it came back to the House and was reduced to \$15,000,000. I undertake to say that the Senate, which had voted \$20,000,000, would not have hesitated to give the \$15,000,000 agreed to by this House, if the measure offered by my friends in the Missouri Legislature had not been defeated by the Missouri radicals. A leading member of that faction in the Missouri Legislature, Mr. Charles P. Johnson, openly proclaimed his gratification, in a social gathering of the brotherhood, at the failure of the appropriation by Congress to pay for the slaves of Missouri. The sentiment was received with applause by his brother radicals.

The statement I have made would appear almost incredible to those unacquainted with the Jacobins of my State; but the record stands to prove the truth of my statement, and to show that these men have been and are still dishonestly clamoring for what they do not want, and will not have: that in fact they wanted slavery to remain as a bone of contention, or else were unwilling that loyal owners should receive payment for their slaves, even when the money was offered by the Federal Government. But my colleague says he is for emancipation without doing injustice to loyal slaveholders. I deny it, and appeal to the records of the Legislature of Missouri to make good my denial. The measure was again and again tendered to them by the Union emancipationists of Missouri, and was as often refused. It was under these circumstances that the convention, a body elected prior to the rebellion, and which was intended by the secession leaders to carry the State out of the Union, but refused to do it, was called together, and upon the recommendation of our late Governor, and in obedience to the wishes of the people, passed an ordinance liberating the slaves of Missouri at the end of seven years, holding them to service for the intermediate period, and subsequently placing the younger slaves in the condition of apprentices until they attained mature years, in lieu of compensation to their owners. That ordinance was

denounced by the radicals in my State, who had proven themselves so false to the cause of emancipation, as a measure for the continuation and perpetuation of slavery. I accepted it as a step in the right direction, believing at the time, and knowing now that the people of the State were fast becoming reconciled to this measure, and that every slave in the State would be emancipated before the time fixed in that ordinance.

But the revolutionary faction had what they desired. They had a bone of contention, and having refused to vote for immediate emancipation when their votes would have secured it, they clamored against the gradual emancipation given them by the convention, and ardent clamoring still for another convention to give them immediate emancipation, which they refused to take when it was in their power, with the money to pay the loyal slaveholders, offered them by the Government of the United States. This is a brief and truthful sketch of the chicanery practised by the malcontent leaders who would turn hypocritical cant for freedom to account to aid their ambition.

Another point of difference alluded to by my colleague, [Mr. BLOW,] and which is urged more elaborately in the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. DAVIS,] who makes common cause with him, is found in the fact that the Union emancipationists of Missouri adhere to the policy of the President in favor of the colonization of the free negroes. These gentlemen are opposed to this policy. Here is the programme which the representatives of the Jacobins of Maryland and Missouri would substitute for the policy proposed by the two Presidents, Jefferson and Lincoln, for the establishment of the negroes in a country of their own, in which they could be governed by their own laws, and be free from the crashing weight of prejudice which always would depress them in the midst of another race, superior in numbers, and wielding the powers of Government. The representative from Missouri says:

"We have no such theories, have indulged no such unkindness to the unfortunate blacks. We are content to let them remain where God in His providence placed them, and with a more elevated sense of justice, to ameliorate their condition at once, and elevate them as speedily as possible on the soil that has been enriched by the sweat of their brows through years of unremitting toil, and crushed and bleeding hearts."

The member from Maryland is even more pointed. He exclaims:

"The folly of our ancestors and the wisdom of the Almighty in its inscrutable purposes, having allowed them to come here, and planted them here, they have a right to remain here, and they will remain here to the latest recorded syllable of time. And whether they become our equals or our superiors, whether they blend or remain a distinct race, your posterity will know, for their eyes will behold them as ours do now. These are things which we cannot control. Laws do not make, laws cannot unmake them. If God has made them our equals, then they will work out the problem which he has sent them to work out; and if God has stamped upon them an incurable inferiority, you cannot make one hair white or black, or a cubit to their stature."

I regret very much that neither of these gentlemen have found it convenient to be present in the House to day. I should like very much to ask them to be a little more explicit. I wish to know exactly what all this flourish about "the elevation of the negro" means. Does it mean that they are to be endowed with the rights of suffrage and of citizenship and of official position? Are they to have a full share in the government established by our ancestors, and a fair start in this race for superiority? It cannot be that these gentlemen intend to thwart the "providence of God" by placing legal impediments or obstacles in the way of the negro, to impede his progress in this contest for superiority with our own race in its inherited dominion; but unfortunately for me and the people to whom this country belongs, neither of these gentlemen are here to respond to the inquiries which I desire to make; and I must look for light on this interesting point in the utterances heretofore made by one of those gentlemen. I find in a speech delivered by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland at the Cooper Institute, in New York, on the 9th day of October last, the following clear and pointed declarations, which throw a flood of light on the question under consideration:

"If we should confer freedom and leave the negro a helpless and disarmed, disfranchised individual you have left him the prey of those that wield political power over him. It will never be that there shall be consolidated liberty at the South until the President shall not merely have proclaimed freedom, but taught the negro the use of arms, and organized him for freedom."

"There can be no liberty in the world without adequate guarantee. The only guarantee to be given to the negroes is, that at the end of the war large masses of them shall be in arms,

5

whom it will be more difficult to reduce to slavery than to let them remain free. ('That's so'.) Great will be our infamy if we should attempt to expel the negro from our soil."

Wendell Phillips has seized upon this happy thought, and, in a recent speech delivered in the same house in the same city, during the present month, thus gives it utterance:

"Such deeds are God's means for making you willing that the negro should occupy this place in the nation's history, with the powers of the white man, lifted to the elective franchise, which protects him and insures us. Break up the land into farms, put two hundred thousand negroes, with a rifle in each right hand and an officer of their own chos'ng a' their head; put three hundred thousand black and white farmers by their s'de, and the South will ripen itself into a democracy. That is natural law out there. Then I would have civil law here mature the same thing."

This, then, is the Winter Davis-Wendell Phillips programme, and shows that they do not wish to give the White man the start of the negro in the great contest for superiority. Mr. Phillips says the negro is to be "lifted to the elective franchise." The gentleman from Maryland is not content with leaving the negro a "disfranchised individual." Both of them agree that they shall be armed amid the unarmed population of the South; and then, in the language of the gentleman from Maryland, "whether they become our equals or superiors, whether they blend or become a distinct race, your posterity will know."

This settles very satisfactorily the meaning of that part of the gentleman's programme in which he goes so earnestly for the elevation of the negro. But I do not see how it is to be reconciled with another theory broached by him in his late speech. He tells us in this elaborate and well-considered effort that the idea of hostility of races is one that is unknown to history; and he calls upon those who have advanced that theory to point to a single instance where such a thing as hostility of race has ever manifested itself. Then why arm the negro? Why at the end of the war must we have "masses of them in arms whom it will be more difficult to reduce to slavery than to let them remain free." Is it not perfectly apparent that the gentleman feels and recognizes the hostility of these races, when he demands that they shall be armed to defend their freedom from another race which will seek to reduce them to slavery? Indeed, why has this race been so long in servitude in our land except that they are negroes and of another race than ours? Is not this the defence and justification that has always been urged for their enslavement? Would our fathers ever have brought them here or their children retained them in bondage, but that the fact of their being of another race gave them a pretext? I will not go outside of the speech the gentleman made on this floor the other day to show that he is himself animated by the very sentiment, *hostility of race*, which he so stoutly and so earnestly denies the existence of. In the very expression of his disbelief in the theory of the hostility of races, he cannot restrain himself from the exhibition of his hatred for Irishmen. He says:

"But the attack of the Irish on the negroes in New York is the only example of the collision of races to sustain the theory. I agree that it is possible that such a class of population as that might be tempted to oppress the negro, but no class of American population would condescend to do it."

"Have not an "American population" held them in bondage for over two hundred years? Was not this oppression? Does not the gentleman demand that they shall be armed to prevent an "American population" from reducing them again to slavery? The old leaven of Know Nothingism works so strongly in the gentleman that he cannot make an argument without upsetting it by an exhibition of his spleen against a foreign and what he considers an inferior race—the Irish. "Won't you sak," he says, "as a matter of kindness, to transplant the Irish back to Ireland?" I certainly should if all Americans bore the hostility to them he manifests.

The political origin of the gentleman from Maryland is identical with that of my colleague, [Mr. Blow,] for they are twin brothers of the dark-lantern fraternity; the chief ingredients of which organization was hostility to kindred races of white men of foreign birth. Taken in connection with the protest of his New York speech against leaving the negro a "disfranchised individual," he wou'd lead me to the conclusion that he would prefer to see Irishmen and other foreigners disfranchised rather than the negro. He would take care of the latter by arming and embodying them and instructing them to defend their franchise. But the doctrine and practice he brought forth into

political life from a Know Nothing lodge arrayed rancorous partisans of native birth to drive naturalized citizens from the polls. His followers were guilty of deeds of unexampled ferocity to deter Irishmen and Dutchmen from the exercise of their legal franchise, and with arms and bloody instruments to withhold from them the privileges he now demands for the negro. Notwithstanding his heart has so recently relented toward the negro, yet his last speech proves that his hatred and detestation of the Irish still survive, and he is the last man in this House or out of it who should venture to stand up and deny that which is attested by all history, and to the truth of which he becomes an unconscious witness in one of the closing paragraphs of his speech, saying:

"Allow me to beseech gentlemen to recollect that we people in America are not the only ones who have prejudices, and that negroes are not the only proscribed race in the world; that other nations have been as unjust and as inclined to oppress, and that we in some regions of the world, would fare no better than negroes do here. How long has it been since 'Dog of a Christian' was the most polite word to us in the Moslem's mouth? How long has it been since a Brahmin would condescend to sit at table with the most aristocratic Englishman?"

The only observation I shall make upon this is that it seems to me that the gentleman's mind is so truthful, and his knowledge of history so accurate, that he cannot make an erroneous argument without exploding it and bringing himself to a sound conclusion.

I submit it to the candor and good sense of the country which proposition is the most benevolent and humane toward this oppressed and much abused African race—that of Jefferson and Lincoln, or that of the Jacobin leaders of Maryland and Missouri. Is it not better for the negroes to have provided a country for them in which they can govern themselves by their own laws, in which they will have no superiors, but will be protected by the power of our Government, rather than remain here as an inferior and subject race—a race of outcasts, so far as social and political rights are concerned—or even under the New York programme, broached by the gentleman from Maryland and Mr. Phillips, to attempt to put them on an equality with white people, which both of these gentlemen say would require to be maintained by force of arms, to prevent the reduction of the negroes to slavery? Can any American citizen find in his heart to inaugurate such a contest as that foreshadowed by these gentlemen? He cannot delude himself into the belief that the riot in New York is an isolated instance. That which occurred there has taken place in almost every large city in the country, in Cincinnati, in Philadelphia, and in the city of Baltimore, where the white caulkers drove away the negro caulkers from the shipyards. He well knows that it will require "large masses of these negroes to be in arms at the end of the war," not to prevent them from being reduced to slavery, for the Government which gave them liberty will secure it to them, but to clothe them with that franchise which he demands for them.

I prefer Mr. Lincoln's humane, wise, and benevolent policy to secure the peace and happiness of both races; and until that can be accomplished, and while both races are being prepared for this great change, I shall repose in perfect confidence in the promise of the President given in his last message, in which he proposes to remit the control of the freedmen to the restored States, promising to support "any provisions which may be adopted by such State government in relation to the freed people of such State which shall recognize and declare their permanent freedom, provide for their education, and which may yet be consistent as a temporary arrangement with their present condition as a laboring, landless and homeless class."

I desire at this point to make some observations upon the action of the recent convention held in Baltimore, and from the proceedings of which the gentleman from Maryland gave us an extract. After nominating Mr. Lincoln for re-election to the Presidency, and instructing its delegates to vote for him, "first, last, and all the time," the convention passed this singular resolution, which the gentleman read to this House. This resolution was all the comfort the gentleman could extract from the proceedings of that body, and it remains to be seen whether that will prove a substantial comfort or not:

"RESOLVED, That this convention is in favor of the entire and immediate abolition of slavery in this State and in the State in rebellion, and is opposed to any re-organization of State governments in these States which do not recognize the immediate and final abolition of slavery as a condition precedent. That this convention expresses her sympathy with the radical emancipationists in Missouri, and in Arkansas, Tennessee and Louisiana, and regret that

influences in the cabinet have in Maryland and those States, depressed the efforts of the radical friends of the Administration and of emancipation, and given prominence to those who are unwilling advocates of emancipation."

Here is a convention nominating Mr. Lincoln, and tying its delegates up to vote for him so tight that it is impossible to cheat in that, and then turning around and extending the right hand of fellowship and expressing sympathy for the Missouri radicals, who cannot find epithets vile enough to apply to him. All the radical members from Missouri in this House and the other branch of Congress are deadly hostile to the President, yet they have the sympathy of the Baltimore convention, which nominated Mr. Lincoln. The radical members of the Missouri Legislature—the party associates of the members on this floor now co-laborers with the gentlemen from Maryland—voted against Mr. Lincoln's renomination, and against the resolution approving his administration, yet they all have the sympathy of the Maryland convention which instructed its delegates to vote for Lincoln, "first, last, and all the time." The radical members from Missouri to the convention of Jacobins at Louisville all voted to nominate an independent candidate against Lincoln. How delighted they will all feel when they find that they have the "sympathy" of the Maryland convention which has indorsed President Lincoln, and made him their candidate! Every radical newspaper in Missouri is unsparing in its denunciation of Lincoln, and most of them are pledged to oppose his election, even if he is nominated by the National Convention of the Union. How pleasing the information will be to them that they have the sympathy of the Maryland convention which nominated Lincoln and handcuffed its delegates to prevent their cheating him!

I am afraid the Missouri radicals will not be able to see the point of this joke without some explanation; and as the gentleman from Maryland did not see fit to go into the matter, I shall undertake the task myself. The late Baltimore convention nominated Mr. Lincoln because they could not help themselves. They were compelled to it by the overwhelming public opinion of the State. There are certain dark-lantern associations still existing in Maryland, by which bogus delegates were sent from three counties, and they were fraudulently allowed to retain their seats, to the exclusion of the rightful delegates. But even this convention did not dare to outrage the sentiment of the people so far as to vote against Lincoln; but they sought, while thus putting the left arm around his neck, saying, "How art thou, my brother?" to stab him under the fifth rib. They tried, therefore, while nominating Lincoln, to put forward delegates who are expected to act as certain Democratic delegations did to Van Buren in 1844. They went to the convention instructed to vote for him, but betrayed their trust. I have heard, but don't know certainly whether the fact is so or not, that one of these delegates, appointed with instructions to vote for Lincoln, "first, last, and all the time," being one of Mr. Chase's office-holders, has already declared his intention not to vote for Lincoln, but for whom he pleases. And since these gentlemen have chosen to go out of their way to make war on the real Union men of my State, and express their sympathy for the Jacobins of Missouri, I do not consider it inappropriate to show up their double-dealing. They sought in every way to escape these binding instructions, and send their delegates untrammeled. Mr. Sterling, a great friend, I understand, of the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. DAVIS,] stated that he did not want any instructions, because that would prevent Maryland from having any influence in regard to the candidate for Vice President. In other words, it would prevent the delegation from trading off the Presidency to obtain the candidate for Vice President from "my Maryland."

The resolution winds up with regrets that influences in the cabinet have depressed the efforts of the radical friends of the administration, "and given prominence to those who are unwilling advocates of emancipation." Who are these unwilling advocates of emancipation? Was he an unwilling advocate of emancipation who first unfurled that banner in Missouri on the Buffalo platform in 1848 in defiance of the pro-slavery sentiment of his State, and in opposition to the views of his great friend Colonel Benton, and who has maintained it ever since? Is he an unwilling advocate of emancipation who presided at the Pittsburg convention which formed the Republican party? Or is that man an "unwilling advocate" who voted against Banks for Speaker; who voted against Sherman for Speaker; who voted against Lincoln and for John Bell, always a trimmer and at last a traitor; and who, not two years ago, denounced the ad-

ministration and its anti-slavery policy in speeches delivered in Brooklyn and Baltimore? Let any honest man answer.

As I said in the outset of my remarks, this whole business in Missouri and Maryland, in the form and shape in which it has made its appearance in these halls, has been concocted for the purpose of defeating the re-nomination of Mr. Lincoln. Does any sane man suppose that those seventy-odd gentlemen came all the way from Missouri as a grand committee of radicals to ask for the removal of Schofield, and with no higher game in view? Would they have gone to call on Mr. Chase in a body to express to him their thanks for the help and sympathy he gave them, and to toast him as their candidate for the Presidency, unless they desired to notify the whole country that they were suffering a great grievance from the President, and that they looked to the Secretary for succor? Does anybody suppose that this grand protest would have been gotten up against Schofield's confirmation, after an agreement to let the thing drop, and that my friends from Iowa would have been prevailed upon, by misrepresentations, to append their names to such a statement? Can it be supposed that such pains would have been taken to draw them into this trap merely for the purpose of procuring the removal of Schofield?

Mr. GRINNELL. I wish to say to the gentleman from Missouri, as one of the Iowa delegation which signed that representation in behalf of our State, that the voters of my district, many of them, reside on the borders of Missouri, and are competent to judge of the condition of affairs over the border, and that I signed that paper in perfect good faith.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I have no doubt of that.

Mr. GRINNELL. We believed that one county in my district was in great danger, as there had been frequent raids into the southern portion of Iowa. I did not sign that paper with any intention of taking part against President Lincoln or Postmaster General Blair, nor for the purpose of affecting the political relations of the State of Missouri. I spoke of what I knew, and with good intentions.

Mr. WILSON. Will the gentleman yield to me one moment?

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. Let me first say a word in reply to the gentleman's colleague. I did not intend to say anything, nor do I mean to be understood as saying anything to indicate that that gentleman, or any part of the Iowa delegation, were privy to the design for which the protest was gotten up. I say they were entrapped into it. That is my opinion about it, and whatever the gentleman may think about the condition of affairs in Missouri, I think he is very much mistaken about it, and the facts have shown that he was mistaken. I did not intend to say that he was privy to the designs of the men engaged in this business, which designs are shown by the utter want of foundation in fact for the statements they made, (I mean the protest, not the statement of the Iowa delegation,) and by their criticism of military affairs, which they were wholly incompetent to criticise, by the manner in which that protest was produced in the Senate—a memorial against the confirmation of a general officer read in open session, and not in executive session, where such confirmations are only considered—everything connected with it shows that the design was to attack the President who had denied the validity of the charges against Schofield. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. WILSON. I do not know but the gentleman from Missouri has a perfect right to speak for the President of the United States in all matters; still I do not know that he has; and I may say that I do not believe that he has that right. When he speaks of the Iowa delegation being drawn into a trap in signing the paper to which he has referred, I wish to tell him as one member of the Iowa delegation that I fell into no trap. I know not what that paper was; I know what it contained, and I know that it contained the truth. That is all I have to say in reply to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I do not dispute that the statement of the gentleman is in accordance with his view of the matter; but I maintain the statement I have made.

Mr. GRINNELL. I wish to say one word more —

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I cannot yield if these interruptions are to be taken from my time.

The CHAIRMAN. It will be taken from the gentleman's time unless unanimous consent be obtained that it shall not be.

Mr. ELDRIDGE. We object if it is to be taken from the time of the gentleman from Missouri.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection the time occupied by interruption will not be taken from the hour to which the gentleman is entitled under the rule.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GRINNELL. Mr. Chairman: The Gentleman from Missouri could not have been cognizant of the facts to which I alluded. I am very glad to hear evidence to the fact that the gentleman was at that time himself leading Iowa soldiers in battle; and I honor him for the position he occupied at the time of these occurrences. But, sir, I say there was a rebel correspondence between northern Missouri and the southern portion of my district for a long time. I say that these border men of Missouri, under the name of Missouri State militia, did come over into my district, and did there threaten loyal men. They did steal horses and rob hen roosts. I say these northern Missouri men, under the name of Missouri State militia, did conspire with men in southern Iowa to blow up the court-house in one of the southwestern counties. They did come over there and unite themselves with Knights of the Golden Circle for the purpose of resisting the draft and preventing Union men from filling up the quota of Iowa. I know these facts, and while I give the gentleman from Missouri full credit for his valor and full credit for his patriotism, still I must say that he is not acquainted with these facts.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. The mere fact that a few marauders did cross the border and commit depredations is no justification for the harsh measures resorted to against General Schofield. It was well understood that the attention of the commanding officer of that department was then directed to another quarter, and that it was impossible to spare troops to guard the long line between the States of Missouri and Iowa. Iowa is so loyal a State, and so remote from the scene of real hostility, that no officer would be justified in placing troops to guard its borders from mere imaginary dangers, or to prevent horse-stealing and hen-roost robbing. Do such facts, conceding them to be true, form any good ground for asking the removal of the general commanding a military department? Such trifles it appears to me bring shame to those who would make them the ground for the removal and degradation of a brave and meritorious officer.

Mr. GRINNELL. One word more, with the permission of the gentleman from Missouri. It was charged by him that the Iowa delegation in signing that Missouri protest had fallen into a trap. I wish to say that I signed that paper with my colleagues with my eyes open. There was no trap. I believed, and my constituents believe to-day, that the general then in command in St. Louis was not as true as he ought to be to his position: I believed that he was using his official position for the purpose of degrading those who are called radical men, like myself. There were men connected with the Army who believed this; and it is my belief now. I believe it from the best of testimony. He may have been a brave man, he may have been a true man; but still the facts I have stated are true; and those of my constituents who had suffered by the raids of these Missouri State militia, whom he was upholding, had a right to enter their protest as they did.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my opinion has not been changed by anything which has been said by the two gentlemen from Iowa. I concede to them entire honesty in their views and purposes; still I believe their interference was used and obtained by misrepresentations. It was not against General Schofield that the originators of this scheme sought the aid of the Iowa Delegation. Their purpose was to level a blow at the President, and induce the Senate of the United States to deal that blow.

Mr. GRINNELL. I wish to distinctly deny that the Iowa delegation had any part or any design to bring an accusation against the President of the United States. That delegation, sir, are not against the President.

Mr. BLAIR, of Missouri. I have again and again said that I did not suppose they had any such design. I put it upon those who originated this affair, and who, having obtained by misrepresentations the statement of the Iowa delegation, used it not against General Schofield, but against the President, as the whole transaction in the Senate shows upon its very face. Now, sir, who is this General Schofield? I knew

him as the officer who mustered the first troops from Missouri at the beginning of the war, in the midst of dangers that the men who are now denouncing him shrank from in dismay. They shrank away in alarm, and their arms hung nerveless by their sides when this officer stood forward bravely in the performance of his duty. He was the companion and trusted friend of the heroic Lyon, who fell dead on the bloody field of Wilson's Creek, almost in his arms. He has approved his loyalty and efficiency on the field of battle; he has tested his valor and devotion to the country. His revilers are that class of noisy patriots whose devotion to the Government is attested only by their clamors.

I do not myself approve of his entire administration in Missouri, but I honor his patriotism and ability, and appreciate the difficulty of his position, made more so by those who have done more complaining than fighting. General Schofield assented to the order by which four counties in my State were depopulated, and the wives and children of twelve hundred Union men then in the United States Army were driven from their homes. He assented to this order given by General Ewing. I did not approve of it. It was a concession to the radicals, who threatened to overthrow the State government, but did not conciliate them.

My colleague [Mr. Blow] asserted in round terms that at a meeting or caucus of my friends in St. Louis, in August, 1862, I had advocated the removal of General Schofield and the substitution of another in the command of the department of Missouri, and that I had deputed him to bear my complaints to the President. I denied the statement; and when, in August, 1862, he came to this city and used my name with the President and General Halleck to effect that purpose I sent a telegram to General Halleck in the following words:

ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI, Aug. 12, 1862.

Major General H. W. HALLECK:

Nobody is authorized to ask Schofield's removal in my name. I have written to Hon. Mr. Blair asking that his powers may be more ample, and that he may be disengaged from the authority of Governor Gamble.

FRANK P. BLAIR, JR.

[Telegram.]

(Official copy.)

HEADQUARTERS, February 25, 1864.

D. C. WAGER, A. A. G.

General Halleck informs me that he told my colleague that he had received this dispatch, and thinks it probable that he showed it to him, and he therefore knew that I did not assent to his coming here to represent me. He knew this when he made the statement on this floor a few days since.

I will state that a meeting of our friends did take place about the time indicated. Many complaints were made in that meeting by my friends against General Schofield. He was not, however, in command of the department: no department commander had then been appointed to succeed General Halleck, who had been ordered here to the chief command a short time previous. General Schofield was in command of the district; Curtis commanded another district; and Schofield had expressed his desire to do what our friends complained of his not doing, but alleged that he had no authority, as he was only a district commander and did not have the authority necessary. I explained this to those present at that meeting. All that I said was in explanation of the matters alleged against General Schofield, based upon his own statements. The only resolution which I proposed was one asking that a department commander might be appointed, and the dispatch I have quoted and the letter referred to in it show very plainly that I would have been well satisfied with the appointment of Gen. Schofield. The statement of my colleague is utterly devoid of truth.

Schofield some time afterwards gave me to understand that the motives of my colleague's volunteering to come to Washington and misrepresent me were that he was the owner of a lead mine in southwest Missouri, which he was desirous should be well guarded by United States troops; that he (Schofield) did not consider it as important

as some other interests, and that he could not spare the troops to advance my colleague's private speculation, and he attributed his hostility to this cause.

The great point of attack made by my colleague in his speech was the resolution I offered in this House, asking a committee to investigate the operations of the Treasury Department in the regulation of the commercial intercourse with the States in insurrection. He passed a high eulogium upon the distinguished Secretary of the Treasury, and denounced me for presuming to introduce such a resolution. He denied that there was any ground for the investigation, and yet he was cautious to vote against my resolution, and so did all the friends of that distinguished gentleman. I say that there is ground for it. I say here in my place and upon my responsibility as a Representative that a more profligate administration of the Treasury Department never existed under any Government; that the whole Mississippi valley is rank and fetid with the fraud and corruption practiced there by his agents; that "permits" to buy cotton are just as much a marketable commodity as the cotton itself; that those permits to buy cotton are brought to St. Louis and other western cities by politicians and favorites from distant parts of the country, and sold on 'change to the highest bidder, whether he be a secessionist or not, and that, too, at a time when the best Union men in these cities were refused permits. That is equally true of the "trade stores," as they are called—monopolies of trade in certain districts or cities in the South. These "trade stores" are given to political partisans and favorites, who share the profits with other men who furnish the capital, Mr. Chase furnishing capital to his friends and partisans in the shape of a permit or privilege to monopolize the trade of a certain city or district; and furthermore, it can be established that the practice of taking bribes on the part of these Treasury agents for permits to trade, and for conniving at violations of law, is so common that it has almost ceased to attract attention or excite comment. It is the most corrupt and demoralizing system that ever was invented, and has become a public scandal. No wonder that General Grant, in his remonstrance against this system, said, "No honest man could do business under such a system." I am satisfied that, upon a rigid and honest scrutiny, the statements I have made can be established by competent proof. Here is a statement which I find in the Baltimore American, a stanch Union paper, and which appears to be vouched by the name of a party whom I take to be responsible and respectable, for otherwise that journal would hardly have inserted his statement. It is as follows:

BALTIMORE, February 2, 1864.

MESSRS. EDITORS OF THE BALTIMORE AMERICAN:

I desire to make known through your paper, to the community generally, something which I am sure will astonish every Union man in our city who has not previously heard of it, and they, I think, are few. It is this, Messrs. Editors, that on Saturday, 30th ult., the schooner Ann Hamilton, Captain Sterling, with Samuel G. Miles on board, as the agent of another party, cleared from this port with a cargo of fifty sacks of salt, and a general assortment of merchandise, valued perhaps at \$10,000 with permission from Mr. Risley, the agent of the Treasury Department, and sanctioned by General Butler, to take the same within the rebel lines, that is to say, to the counties of Northumberland and Lancaster, State of Virginia.

Had Jeff. Davis himself requested the Government authorities to send him the amount of goods taken from here by Mr. Miles, and the authorities had consented to grant the same, I am sure I would not have been more astonished. It is well known, Messrs. Editors, that the Government has no troops in either of those two counties, has no custom officers to examine what may be proposed to be landed, and that that section is as much under rebel jurisdiction as Charleston, South Carolina. As to the truth of this statement I can point out to you dozens of men in the State of Maryland who have been compelled to flee their homes and families in those two counties, and who dare not return to the same. No Union man can go to either of them for the simple reason that he would be immediately arrested and sent on his way to Richmond.

But while it is a matter of astonishment that a cargo of goods should be allowed by those in authority to go there (a portion of country entirely under rebel rule,) it is equally so that Mr. Miles, a man known to almost every Union man in Baltimore to be one of the bitterest rebels we have among us, who has from the commencement done and said all that he could against the Government; a man who could not engage in the worship of God in the New Assembly Rooms—could not think of such a thing, because General Schenck had ordered the Stars and Stripes to be suspended in the room; a man who indorsed and commended the action of the mob on the 19th of April, 1861, in murdering Massachusetts soldiers in our streets,

and one perhaps who has rendered more aid and comfort to the rebels, or as much, at least, as any man in our city, by sending goods to the very counties named ever since the rebellion commenced, setting at defiance the blockade; that such a man, a known enemy of the Government, should be allowed to take within the rebel lines a large number of boxes of merchandise said to contain certain articles, as per manifest, and the vessel, too, commanded by Captain Sterling, who, I am informed, has long ago made the acquaintance of Fort McHenry on account of his blockade-running proclivities—if this is not astonishing, then, Messrs. Editors, what would be?

But, sirs, there is something also to be looked at in this affair. Who are the parties who have thus imposed on General Butler? for no one believes, who knows the General, that he would ever have consented to this project had he known the character of Mr. Miles. Some parties professing to be Union men must have imposed on Mr. Risley and General Butler also; and I think, sirs, the community ought to know who they are. I, for one, cannot believe that General Butler would ever have consented to allow such a privilege to one so well known in this community as one of the greatest friends of those in arms seeking to destroy the very Government that he (General B.) has been so nobly and skillfully upholding.

I could give you many proofs of the truth of what I say in regard to Mr. Miles; and as to the facts of the vessel clearing from this port, that can be obtained by calling upon the proper officers at our custom-house. I will only add, Messrs. Editors, that if such a privilege is granted to Mr. Miles, and they are fully aware of his sentiments, &c., I think the authorities ought to carry the matter a little further, and return to him the amount of money they have received from the sale of his goods they have captured while trying to run the blockade—more especially those captured on board the schooner Hampton, Captain Roe, (in one of the very counties to which he now goes,) about a year since—as that was quite a snug little sum.

By publishing this letter in your valuable journal, thereby calling the attention of the two gentlemen who I am sure have been grossly deceived in the matter, you will much oblige your friend.

STEPTOE B. TAYLOR.

Is this a matter worth inquiring into? Such an act in aid of the rebels in arms would send any one, except a Treasury Agent, to Fort Lafayette.

Sir, if the friends of the Secretary of the Treasury had not felt that these facts could be proven they would not have voted against investigation, but would, on the contrary, have invited it. The friends of the Secretary of the Navy when assailed by the friends of Mr. Chase have invited scrutiny and have not asked that those gentlemen who desired to investigate his proceedings or the affairs of his Department should be kept off the committee of investigation. The cotton-spinner (Assistant Secretary Fox) to whom the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. Davis] alludes so contemptuously, (forgetting for the moment that he is now attempting to patronize that most meritorious class of New England men,) has brought with him from his northern home the same sturdy honesty that distinguishes the men with whom he labored, as well as the honor of the Navy, which has never been tarnished and in which he gained his first distinction. He and the Secretary of the Navy will not permit their friends to shield them by voting against resolutions of inquiry or investigation, and are ready to commit the inquiry to those who make the accusations.

My colleague [Mr. Blow] was very apprehensive lest I should be put on the committee which I had moved, and gives that as a reason for voting against the scrutiny. I do not think the action of the speaker in that regard need strike him with any great tremor. There has been no disposition on the part of the Speaker to place me upon committees when he could avoid it. I came here somewhat late, having "lingered in the field," as my colleague says reprovingly, until active operations were over, and stood upon no committee. Soon afterwards a committee was created on the conduct of the war, and to examine into fraudulent contracts in the War Department. There was immediately "a double shuffle" of the cards in the face of the House. One of my colleagues [Mr. Loan] resigned his place on the Military Committee, and was placed on the new committee, and I was put into his old shoes. It would seem, therefore, that the Speaker is not anxious to place me where I could pry into these delicate matters. I cannot perceive the propriety of the gentleman's doubts as to the Speaker's entire impartiality. He has already declared in a public card that he is not for Lincoln for the next Presidency, and even goes so far as to say that he is for none of the prominent candidates named for that high place. No man could possibly occupy a more impartial attitude. [Laughter.]

No one can have failed to observe the broad distinction between the conduct of the

friends of the Secretary of the Navy and that of the friends of the Secretary of the Treasury upon matters of this kind. The Secretary of the Navy has invited scrutiny into the affairs of his Department, and those who have made accusations and moved resolutions of inquiry have become conductors of the scrutiny without complaint or resistance on the part of his friends. This is proper and parliamentary; any other course would suffice investigation and be unfair to those who make the accusations. The law of parliamentary proceedings says that "the child is not to be put to a nurse that cares not for it"—an investigation is not to be committed to those who oppose it. "It is therefore a constant rule," says the Manual, "that no man is to be employed in any matter who has declared himself against it." "And when any member who is against the bill (or inquiry) hears himself named of its committee he ought to ask to be excused." (Barclay's Digest, p. 84.) If the scrutiny is intrusted to those who are opposed to it, of course nothing will be found; nor is it fair to him who alleges, upon his responsibility as a member, that there is ground for investigation, to deny him the opportunity of establishing it. What I ask in this matter is that the friends of the Secretary of the Treasury will concede what is demanded by parliamentary law, and then I will stand or fall by the result. I am without the power, position, or ability of the distinguished Secretary, but my reputation is as dear to me as his can be to him or his friends. I have made the allegations, and I have offered to put them to the test. His friends have refused it, and in doing so have stabbed their friend. I have taken this course because time and again remonstrances have been made against the nefarious system which inflicts so much injury upon my constituents and the whole West; the Secretary has treated these representations with contempt; and his advocates, when hard pressed, have sought to shift the burden upon the shoulders of the President and General Grant. Not content with using this vast patronage to undermine the man who gave him his position, he seeks to cast the odium of his own corrupt acts upon him whose confidence he has thus betrayed.

What right under the law had he to impose its restrictions within the State of Missouri? The law was enacted to regulate trade and intercourse between loyal States and States in insurrection. Does it allow restrictions within the State of Ohio? Has Missouri ever been declared in insurrection? Missouri has always had a loyal government, recognized by every department of the Federal Government; and although her territory has been invaded by the enemy, yet for a year past no force as formidable as that with which John Morgan invaded Indiana and Ohio has trodden upon her soil, or remained there as long or fared better during their sojourn. Why, then, keep these restrictions in Missouri, and not in Ohio and Indiana? Until within the last month a man living in Missouri, twenty miles from St. Louis, could not get a barrel of salt or flour from that city without paying for a permit. I am told that a judge of our supreme court living in the adjoining county of St. Charles, paid for a permit in St. Louis to take a picture of General Washington to his home as a Christmas present to his children. This thing has been continued within the last twenty days; and for the last six months no organized force of the enemy has penetrated north of the Arkansas river. It was at last discontinued on the petition of my distinguished radical colleagues, and blazoned as a triumph of their influence. The Secretary could not have been hurried any by my resolution, for he felt himself safe here in the hands of his friends. It was brought to me to sign. I signed, not that petition, but a statement "that in my opinion there had been no excuse for this thing for the last six months;" but for fear of offending the august Secretary my protest and signature were erased. My colleague taunts me with my zeal for my "trading friends." I have none who would "trade" off the rights intrusted to their defense for the smiles of a man in power.

The permit system has finally been abandoned in Missouri, but the agents and officials who formerly spread this network over our desolated State and pinched its ruined inhabitants, still remain. These dependents on the Secretary, these miscreants of his presidential aspirations, are still extant, and receive their salaries. Some of them, I suppose, employ themselves in disseminating that "strictly private" circular which came to life the other day, which informs us that the friends of Mr. Chase, who have so feelingly denounced all open efforts to bring forward a candidate for the Presidency, have been secretly forming an organization in his favor all over the country,

and which charges the administration of Mr. Lincoln with "corruption." None know better than the friends of Mr. Chase at whose door that corruption lies, as their efforts to stifle investigation here so plainly prove.

It is a matter of surprise that a man having the instincts of a gentleman would remain in the Cabinet after the disclosure of such an intrigue against the one to whom he owes his portfolio.

I presume the President is well content that he should stay; for every hour that he remains sinks him deeper in the contempt of every honorable man.

Mr. Chairman, I give notice that on Monday next, or as soon thereafter as I am permitted to do so, I will reintroduce the resolution which I have already had the honor to propose to the House, and if not again refused by the friends of the Secretary, I will either establish the facts I have alleged, or I will make the amplest reparation in my power to the distinguished gentleman at the head of the Treasury.







